1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
3	No. 1:17-cv-12269-WGY
4	
5	REGINALD HALL and ANGELINA HALL,
6	Plaintiffs
7	vs.
8	
9	SANTANDER BANK and FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE
10	ASSOCIATION, Defendants
11	
12	* * * * * *
13	
14	For Hearing Before: Judge William G. Young
15	
16	Temporary Restraining Order
17	United States District Court
18	District of Massachusetts (Boston) One Courthouse Way
19	Boston, Massachusetts 02210 Monday, November 19, 2018
20	
21	* * * * * *
22	
23	REPORTER: RICHARD H. ROMANOW, RPR Official Court Reporter
24	United States District Court One Courthouse Way, Room 5510, Boston, MA 02210
25	bulldog@richromanow.com

```
APPEARANCES
1
 2
 3
    HARRY R. THOMASSON, JR., ESQ.
       Law Office of Harry R. Thomasson, Esq.
 4
       3280 Sunrise Highway, Suite 112
       Wantagh, NY 11793
       (516) 557-5459
 5
       Email: Hrtatty@verizon.net.
 6
       For Plaintiffs
 7
    JEFFREY D. ADAMS, ESQ.
8
       Parker Ibrahim & Berg, LLC
9
       One Financial Center
       Boston, MA 02111
10
       (617) 918-7600
       Email: Jeffrey.adams@piblaw.com
11
       For Defendants
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
PROCEEDINGS
1
 2
                (Begins, 3:15 p.m.)
 3
                THE CLERK: Now hearing Civil Matter 17-12269,
     Hall versus Santander Bank.
 4
                THE COURT: Good afternoon. Would counsel
 5
     identify themselves.
 6
 7
                MR. THOMASSON: Good afternoon, your Honor,
8
     Harry Thomasson, 3280 Sunrise Highway, Suite 112,
9
     Wantagh, New York, for Reginald Hall and Angelina Hall.
10
           Your Honor, Ms. Gaudet also informed me, um, our
11
     expert is not an attorney so I asked if she could sit at
12
     counsel table with me, and she wanted me to just make
     sure the Court knew her name. Her name is Marie
13
14
     McDonald.
15
                THE COURT: She's welcome and she may sit at
16
     counsel table. I do not anticipate that this would be
17
     an evidentiary hearing.
                MR. THOMASSON: I understand, Judge, it's just
18
19
     for my help.
                MR. ADAMS: Good afternoon, your Honor, Jeff
20
     Adams on behalf of Santander Bank and Federal
21
22
     National Mortgage Association.
23
                THE COURT: Yes, well good afternoon.
24
           I would like to introduce that we have two judges
25
     from the district courts of Japan who are observing our
```

procedures and I welcome them to this courtroom, and I wanted to note their presence.

Now, on Thursday afternoon I got a rather chatty letter from Mr. Thomasson and in it he speaks very highly of you, Mr. Adams, so why don't I start with you.

What's going on?

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, back in September of 2017 the housing court, um --

THE COURT: I don't need the full -- here's my concern, here's why -- based on a letter to the Court, I entered a temporary restraining order, which is extraordinary for me. I did that because there is the claim that there was what I'll refer to as a "standstill agreement," at least through the 29th when Santander's motion to dismiss could be heard, and that Santander reneged on it -- not you, but the bank. Explain that to me? That's my concern.

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, neither Santander or Fannie Mae reneged on that agreement to not enforce the order from the Court to evict the plaintiffs, what happened is the order from the Court had expired because of a certain amount of time passing, since it was issued by the housing court. So the eviction counsel went into court and ordered to have it renewed.

There was no directive, no intent to go ahead and

move forward with the eviction of the plaintiffs here.

I spoke with Mr. Thomasson Thursday morning, he called
me concerned with that, I told him I would contact my
clients and find out what was going on. I reached back
out to Mr. Thomasson, left him a voice mail, never heard
back from him.

Upon receiving his letter, your Honor, on
Thursday, within the hour I had an e-mail to the clerk
of the court informing this Court that neither Fannie
Mae, who has to power to evict, nor Santander, both my
clients, had any intent to move forward with the
eviction prior to this Court's order of November 29th,
um, the oral argument on plaintiffs's motion for
preliminary injunction.

I was very clear, your Honor, with the e-mail that I sent on Thursday and I've been clear all along with Attorney Thomasson that there would be no attempt to evict the plaintiffs without prior notice. I was well aware that plaintiffs had filed a motion to enjoin, um, such an eviction, and I stuck to my word, your Honor, and I spoke with my clients and they had no intent to move forth with the eviction.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So, Mr. Thomasson, um, I want to tell you that the practice in this court --

Where did you learn to write letters to a court 1 2 seeking action from a court? 3 MR. THOMASSON: Judge, all I wrote to --THE COURT: First my question. Where did you 4 5 learn that? 6 MR. THOMASSON: First of all, it happens in 7 New York all the time. 8 THE COURT: Well it's improper in this court. So let's start out with that. Don't ever again write a 9 10 letter to this court, because if you do, I won't read it 11 the next time. The only thing you write to this court 12 is a motion. 13 Now I don't mind a chatty motion, but it's got to 14 be a motion, which can be properly docketed and I'll 15 decide whether I'll treat it ex parte or not. Now pro ses write "letters" to the Court. This Court is not in 16 the habit of receiving letters and I don't ever want to 17 18 see a letter again. 19 Now having said that, now that I get into this, 20 you know -- it's almost like -- well I'll get back to Mr. Adams. 21 22 Mr. Adams, you removed the case to this court, 23 right? MR. ADAMS: That's correct, your Honor. 24 25 THE COURT: Now you removed it because on

their complaint arguably it's got federal claims in it, but the gravamen -- because now, having galvanized myself into shall I grant emergency relief? And somewhat embarrassed, but I've -- I'm beyond that, having just endorsed temporary relief on a letter without, for instance, giving you a chance to file the e-mail that you said you filed, um, and having called for a hearing, that's not my practice and all counsel should understand that. Still I've prepared for this hearing. The law clerks have turned too, I mean we're getting set for the hearing on the 29th.

Your -- the gravamen of your motion to dismiss is, in essence it's all over, it's all been decided in the housing court of Southeastern, Massachusetts, and I will tell you that appears to be correct. So it looks to me like I don't have subject matter jurisdiction. Under Rooker v. Feldman, it also looks to me that the case was improvidently removed because if there's to be a collateral attack on the final unappealed order of the housing court of Southeastern, Massachusetts, it should be in that court.

Now you think that makes sense, don't you?

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, I understand your

point and it does make sense, however we did remove

based on two reasons, one, based on a federal question,

```
certainly, but also on diversity, Santander is not a
1
 2
     citizen of Massachusetts, nor is Fannie Mae --
 3
                THE COURT: Ah --
                MR. ADAMS: -- and a threshold question
 4
 5
     exceeds 75,000.
 6
                THE COURT: Yes. You know I mean to raise
 7
     that with you.
8
           I read a very interesting article in the Globe,
     maybe someone has called it to your attention, it's
9
10
     entitled "Scott Powell is Running Santander under Less
11
     Stress, " November 11th, 2018. It strongly suggests that
12
     the principal place of business in the United States of
     Santander is within this district.
13
14
           Now I'm not unaware that there is a suggestion in
15
     a decision -- Wachovia, and you know the law here, that
16
     banks can only be sued in their -- where the
17
     association's personal place of business is, and that is
     Delaware.
18
19
                MR. ADAMS:
                            That's correct, your Honor.
20
                THE COURT:
                            That's an open question in the
21
     First Circuit. I wonder if you want me to consider that
22
     question?
23
                MR. ADAMS: Well, your Honor, there hasn't
24
     been a motion to remand, I'll note that, but then also,
25
     your Honor --
```

THE COURT: But of course I can do that on my own motion.

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, you certainly can. We have argued this before other district court judges in this jurisdiction, your Honor, who've agreed that Santander is a citizen of the State of Delaware.

THE COURT: Yeah. Oh, I understand the different argument. The First Circuit hasn't spoken to it. You're their -- you're counsel for them, I'm sure this is an issue that's come up, but when you raise it, I simply want to throw that out to you.

Even with diversity your position is there's nothing here for me to do, nothing for me to do because everything's been done in the housing court of Southeastern, Massachusetts. So if you've got everything that you want, I would dismiss this action on the grounds of claim preclusion, right, that's what you want on the 29th?

MR. ADAMS: That's correct, your Honor, pursuant to judgments from the Southeast housing court and a judgment from the Bristol Superior Court for --

THE COURT: Of course. Well why isn't it more consonant with *Rooker v. Feldman*, on my own motion, to remand this to the housing court of Southeastern

Massachusetts where, if they had any hope of making a

collateral attack, having never appealed on the decision of that court, they can address the Court directly, rather than wrestling with that here?

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, for many different reasons of which I'm sure your Honor is aware.

THE COURT: Actually -- I'm not just being rhetorical, I'm not, I don't understand why you came here?

MR. ADAMS: Okay. When presented with the opportunity to litigate these cases in federal court as opposed to the state courts, we find that the federal courts and its judges have more time, resources, and opportunity to review pleadings and matters and, um, render decisions which we believe are pursuant to the law in a more efficient manner.

THE COURT: I follow.

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, it's been my experience, over 10 years of practicing, that a case with issues like this could spend years in state court even where such strong arguments of res judicata present itself, among others.

And so, your Honor, given my experience, given my client's preferences -- and, your Honor, honestly referring back to the exact same complaint plaintiffs previously filed before your Honor, which you reviewed

```
and said to the plaintiffs, "This belongs to be
1
     reviewed" -- "This should be reviewed on appeal at the
 2
     state level." So -- so what happened thereafter, your
 3
 4
     Honor --
                THE COURT: I've looked at the docket.
 5
 6
                MR. ADAMS: What happened thereafter, your
 7
     Honor, is that because they had lost the opportunity to
8
     appeal because they missed this deadline, they went
     ahead and just filed the exact same complaint in state
9
10
     court. Given the availability to remove it, which we
11
     believe that we have, we chose that option for the
12
     reasons I just presented to you.
13
                THE COURT: Thank you. I very much appreciate
14
     your candid answer. However, in the same manner, it
15
     isn't a question of forum shopping, it's a question of
16
     jurisdiction under the law. Given Rooker vs. Feldman,
17
     and the strong argument that res judicata does exist,
18
     the one thing you --
19
           Where did they originally file the case that is
20
     now --
21
                MR. ADAMS: Down in the Southeast housing
22
     court, your Honor.
23
                THE COURT: Yeah, well that's where it would
24
     go.
25
           Well I'm disposed to send it back there, despite
```

1 your argument. Mr. Thomasson, why don't I do that right now? 2 3 MR. THOMASSON: First, Judge, first of all I just want to clear up one thing. I don't agree that 4 5 this Court was sending us back to the Southeast housing 6 court for the --7 THE COURT: Well that's my question, why 8 shouldn't I? MR. THOMASSON: -- for the purpose of an 9 10 appeal. 11 THE COURT: I'm not sending you back for the purpose of an appeal, it appears to me that your rights 12 13 are gone. 14 MR. THOMASSON: I have a very strong argument 15 on the subject of res judicata, Judge, and I know that 16 -- it sounds like we're not going to make it here. 17 THE COURT: It does. MR. THOMASSON: So I'll just say it, in equal 18 19 candor, Judge, to Mr. Adam's candor, that I did not put 20 up the strongest of arguments with this court when you 21 said that our complaint last year before you should have 22 been more rightfully brought in the Southeast housing 23 court because when you said it you caught me off guard 24 because I hadn't really given it complete consideration,

I thought that with my federal claims I should be here,

25

and you pointed out that I still could be there with 1 2 them and that's where we should go. And I didn't put up the biggest argument in the world because I thought, 3 quite candidly when you said it, that you were right, 4 5 and especially in citing Feldman. 6 So I just want to say that if the Court is 7 inclined to do that, I don't have much of an argument to 8 tell you not to. 9 THE COURT: I think I am required to under the 10 law. 11 MR. THOMASSON: Right. 12 THE COURT: Therefore the temporary restraining order the Court has earlier entered is 13 vacated, the case is remanded, on the Court's own 14 15 motion, to the housing court of Southeastern 16 Massachusetts. That's the order of the court. 17 MR. THOMASSON: Judge, may I ask one thing? THE COURT: Of course. 18 19 MR. THOMASSON: When we did this last year, 20 for the purpose of having the time to refile paperwork, I mean this remand -- this is remanded to housing court. 21 22 Last year you instructed me to go file it there and you 23 gave me a TRO for enough time to go do it. 24 THE COURT: Now you have to ask them. 25 MR. THOMASSON: Right, now it's being

```
remanded. There's a difference.
1
 2
                THE COURT: There is.
 3
                MR. THOMASSON: And, um, is -- right, I have
     to go ask them. The same thing, yeah.
 4
 5
                THE COURT: Correct. The case is alive. I
     think I will -- though I accept everything that
 6
 7
     Mr. Adams said, I will say he appears to be acting
8
     honorably throughout, but I don't think I have subject
     matter jurisdiction to enter a temporary restraining
9
10
     order.
11
           The case is remanded to that court. All your
12
     arguments, strong or not, shall be addressed to that
13
     court. That's the order of the court. It's remanded.
14
     We're in recess.
                (Ends, 3:30 p.m.)
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

C E R T I F I C A T EI, RICHARD H. ROMANOW, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER, do hereby certify that the foregoing record is a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes before Judge William G. Young, on Monday, November 19, 2018, to the best of my skill and ability. /s/ Richard H. Romanow 12-03-18 RICHARD H. ROMANOW Date